

STANDING TERMS

Single copy, one year	\$2
Three copies, one year	5
Five copies, one year	8
Ten copies, one year	15
Single copy, six months	1
Ten copies, six months	8

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 25 cents commission on each new yearly, and 25 cents on each new semi-yearly subscriber, except in the case of a copy for six months; a club of ten (five of whom may be old ones) at \$15.00 to a copy for one year.

Money to be forwarded by mail, at our risk. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

It will be seen that the price of the paper, single copy, is still \$2 a year. Agents sometimes allow a subscriber, whom they obtain or renew, the benefit of their commission, so that the subscriber by their kindness gets his paper for \$1.50 or \$1.75, as the case may be.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1852.

On our other form is published, at the request of several friends, an "Address to the Anti-Slavery Christians of the United States," signed by a number of influential citizens, which we hope will be attentively read, notwithstanding its length. In a late New York paper we observed an extract of a letter from the venerable ex-Chief Justice Horsey, of New Jersey, which refers to this address as follows: "In every word of Anti-Slavery sentiment and doctrine contained in that address, I most cordially and entirely sympathize."

A HEAVY NUMBER.—The National Conventions fortunately come to pass only once in four years. Our readers will therefore excuse us for devoting so much of this number to their proceedings. The balloting in the Democratic Convention, which occupy nearly the whole of our fourth page, are placed on record for reference. Our inside pages are nearly filled with the history of the acts and sayings of the late Whig Convention, and an examination of the two platforms of the old parties.

Very rarely does it happen that our paper is so crowded with long articles. But this number it seemed necessary. We were anxious to clear our table of important political matter, so that we might, as soon as possible, be able to furnish the usual variety to our readers.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN

Copies of this work are for sale at the office of the National Era, 7th Street. Price—in paper covers, \$1; cloth, \$1.50; cloth, full gilt, \$2. Persons at a distance not over 500 miles can have this work in paper covers mailed to them free of postage on addressing J. C. Stephens, at this office, and enclosing \$1 in money and 27 cents in post-office stamps—over 500 miles the postage will be 54 cents.

CONGRESS.

Congress transacted no business last week, owing to the meetings of the Whig Convention. Both Houses met once or twice, to adjourn Tuesday last they again met. The Senate was chiefly employed in Executive session; the House gave the quietus to Bennett's bill for Land Distribution, and adjourned without doing anything else of importance.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

Notice is hereby given, that a National Convention, consisting of Delegates of the Free Democracy, will assemble at the city of Pittsburgh, on Wednesday, the eleventh day of August next, at noon, for the purpose of selecting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Friends of the principle declared at Buffalo, at the memorable Convention of August, 1848, are requested, within their respective States and Congressional Districts, to meet and elect Delegates, wherever the same has not already been done—each State being entitled to three times the number of its delegation in the Congress of the United States.

By order of the General Free Soil Committee.
SAMUEL LEWIS, Chairman.

Washington, June 19, 1852.

The attention of the friends of Liberty throughout the country is called to the foregoing announcement. Where are the three hundred thousand voters who in 1848 cast their votes against the old parties, on account of their subjection to Slaveryholding rule? Where are the thirty thousand Liberty men in New York, who voted with the Radical Democracy, with the understanding that the principles proclaimed in Buffalo in 1848 were to be the basis of the Party? Are they disposed to follow the lead of John Van Buren and Henry B. Stanton, in the support of a candidate pledged by the platform to resist the agitation of the question of Slavery in Congress and out of it, under whatever shape or color—whether in the shape of free discussion by the press, action by ecclesiastical bodies, or opposition to the annexation of Cuba, or division of California on Anti-Slavery grounds?

Let us hear from them on the 11th of August.

And what say the Whigs who are tired of the yoke? How do they like their compromise platform? Do they feel like swearing by the fidelity of that Fugitive Law, which they have denounced as a foul blot on the statute book?

Let us hear from them, too, on the eleventh of August.

It will be observed that Pittsburgh has been selected as the place of meeting instead of Cleveland, as originally announced. The change was made in accordance with the unanimous opinion of the friends of the Convention in Washington. The time is also fixed on the 11th, instead of the 4th of August, and this change is made to accommodate the East, where the harvests are later than in the West.

MR. WEBSTER AND THE NOMINATION.

A crowd of Scott men last Monday night waited upon several distinguished gentlemen, to congratulate with them on the nomination of General Scott—among them, Mr. Webster, who is reported to have spoken as follows:

I thank you, fellow-citizens, for this friendly call. The Convention at Baltimore have been engaged in the performance of an arduous and difficult duty. It has so happened, from the influence of circumstances, that my name has been before them in connection with others. The choice, gentlemen, has fallen upon another. In the selection that has been made I doubt not the Convention has exercised their great and sound discretion. For myself, gentlemen, I remain unchanged, the same in character, principles, and position. Of one thing, gentlemen, I can assure you, that no man among you will enjoy a sadder night's sleep than I shall. I shall rise in the morning, God willing, with the lark, and though he is a sweeter singer than I, he will not spring to the sky, to greet the purpling East, more jocund and joyous than I, to the performance of my duty. I can only add, that I have no personal feelings nor wishes in the matter. You, gentlemen, have hardly any in your sense of duty. With so many brilliant stars shining about you, you will not fail to perceive the way. Thanking you for this friendly attention, and with my sincere wishes for your welfare and happiness, I bid you good night.

THE PLOTTERS IN CALIFORNIA.

The pro-slavery men in California have been bled thus far in their diabolical scheme for the overthrow of Free Labor institutions in that State, are trying to divert public attention from their own miserable intrigues by fictitious denunciations against the Abolitionists. They charge upon them the delay in the admission of California into the Union, knowing the charge to be grossly false. The admission of California from its first application was urged by every Anti-Slavery member of Congress, and resisted only by a faction determined to stop the wheels of Government rather than yield one hair's breadth. It was the slaveholding interest that kept California out of the Union; first, with a view to run the Missouri line through it, and make the lower half of it a slave State; and secondly, for the purpose of extorting from the North, as the price of the recognition of a sovereign non-slaveholding State, the sacrifice of the Wilmot Proviso.

The San Francisco Herald is specially ferocious against the Abolitionists in California.

"The public," it says, "cannot be too much on its guard respecting this wily enemy. Abolitionism must be closely watched, and every one who takes part in, or aids or abets it, should be looked upon as a public enemy, unworthy of office or support. It cannot be that this vile incendiary shall be permitted to have a footing in this State. Even in New Hampshire, that lowest depth of Abolitionism, that State, which was at one time so sunk in Abolitionism as to elect John P. Hale to the United States Senate, and to be considered beyond even the hope of resurrection, that State which literally 'stoned the prophets' and set at naught the teachings and admonitions of the founders of the Republic and of the immortal Washington himself, even New Hampshire has returned to her senses, and has in her recent elections repudiated the vile thing. Shall we in California—the latest born of our Republican family, at this day, and with the results of fanaticism before us in the old States—shall we embark in a wild crusade against the Constitution and our fellow-citizens of the Southern States, in pursuit of a phantom, and for the benefit of a few designing persons, whose only object is the spoils of office? We shall see."

Pretty talk from a wild crusader against the Constitution of the United States, and its peculiar institutions, against the rights and interests of its citizens, especially of those who earn their living by the sweat of their brows!

He is an Abolitionist of the worst and vilest kind—he seeks the abolition of freedom and free labor, and in the prosecution of this speech object, he would abolish freedom of speech and of the press, and proscribe every citizen who is laboring to arouse the people of California to the danger which threatens their free institutions.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "FINALITY."

The following resolution was adopted by the late National Democratic Convention:

"That the Democratic Party of the Union, standing upon the national platform, will abide by, and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures, settled by the last Congress—the act for the reclaiming of fugitives from service or labor included—which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficacy."

The Southern Whigs in caucus assembled at Baltimore, on the eve of the meeting of the late National Whig Convention, agreed upon "a platform," which was ordered to be submitted to the Convention with an earnest request that it be adopted. It contained the following resolution in relation to the Compromise, which, as finally adopted by the National Convention, stood as follows:

"That the series of acts of the 31st Congress, the act known as the Fugitive Slave Law included, are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace; and so far as they are concerned, we will maintain them, and insist upon their strict enforcement, until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation, to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other—not impairing their present efficiency; and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, wherever, whenever, or however, the attempt may be made; and we will maintain this system as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union."

The resolutions agree in regard to the Fugitive Law. Both contain a pledge to its "faithful execution," or what is the same thing, its "strict enforcement." Neither excludes amendment; both admit of the possibility of amendments, provided they do not "impair the efficiency" of the Law. Neither asserts the principle of finality, as it respects the law; consequently, it is not regarded as a "final settlement" of the question of the rendition of fugitive slaves. The question is clearly left open, and the Whig resolutions contemplate two ways in which it might be legitimately renewed—in one, for the purpose of amending the Law, so as to prevent evasion, in the other, of so amending it as to correct abuse. The opponents and supporters of the law are left equally at liberty to agitate the subject.

As it respects the Compromise measures, (not including the Fugitive Law) the resolutions substantially agree. Neither expresses any opinion concerning their merits; both pledge acquiescence in them. One resolve pledges the Democratic party to abide by, and adhere to a "faithful execution of," that series of acts the other declares that they "are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States as a settlement, in principle and substance, of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace." All that this declaration means finds its entire equivalent in the brief phrase of the Democratic resolve, "to abide by."

Let us look into the operation of the pledges assumed by these resolutions.

As we have seen, the principle of finality is not recognized in relation to the Fugitive Law. The policy of the Slaveholding Interest required that it should be left open to modification, the Legislature of Maryland being the first legislative body to propose an amendment, with a view to increase its efficacy.

Nor do they recognize the Compromise acts as a final settlement of all questions of Slavery; nothing is said or implied on this point. They are regarded simply as a settlement of the questions which they embraced. As such, the Democratic Convention resolved to "abide by" them, and the Whig Convention to "receive and acquiesce in them."

What were the questions embraced in them?

As it regards California, they were—
First, Shall it be admitted into the Union as a sovereign State, notwithstanding the irregularity attending its organization, and the adoption of a constitutional clause inhibiting Slavery? Secondly, Shall it be divided, so as to admit the northern half of it as a non-slaveholding State, and provide for the organization of a Territorial Government in the southern half, without any clause excluding Slavery?

It is a matter of record, that the main effort

of the pro-slavery members of Congress was to effect a division of California, so as to lay open its southern portion to the introduction of Slavery; the proposition for division was renewed, at least, half a dozen times in the Senate. But these questions were settled by the admission of the whole of California, and as a non-slaveholding State. The two Conventions, in resolving to abide by the Compromise acts, or, in the language of the Whig resolve, to receive and acquiesce in that series of acts, as a settlement of the questions they embrace, resolve, therefore, not to disturb the act admitting California, and not to re-open the question of its division with a view of allowing Slavery to occupy its southern portion. This is the plain, unmistakable meaning of the pledge assumed in both resolutions.

Now, does any pro-slavery man really intend to be bound by such a pledge? Will it be recognized by a single Southern member of either House of Congress, should the conspiracy against Free Labor in California succeed so far as to bring an application to Congress from that State for division? We know it will not. Already, members from the South, most vociferous in favor of finality tests, have boldly proclaimed their purpose in this respect. Last Monday week, in the House, while crowds of delegates, on their way to the Whig Convention in Baltimore, were in attendance, Mr. Gentry of Tennessee, in an elaborate speech, announced to the Northern Whigs the terms on which their Southern friends would hereafter consent to act with them. At the close of his remarks, Mr. Campbell of Ohio responded to Mr. Outlaw of North Carolina, who had taken precisely similar ground, the following question:

"The admission of California, with a Constitution prescribing her territorial limits, and excluding slavery therefrom, was one of the measures reported by the Compromise Committee of thirteen, and which was passed by that Congress. I desire to inquire of that gentleman whether he, as a North Carolina Whig, stands prepared to pledge himself for the present, and for the future, to resist every attempt which may be made by the people of California to divide that State, so as to create a slave State?"

Mr. Outlaw replied:
"I have to say that California, by the act to which he has alluded, is admitted a sovereign State into this Union, and that she has the same rights and the same powers as any other State in this Union—that, in my opinion, whenever she is admitted to the great body of the United States to divide her territory, and they shall deem it for the interest of the country that it shall be divided, it may be done without any infringement of the Compromise measures."

In reply to the same question, Mr. Gentry said:
"I will remark to the gentleman in reply, that I stand with respect to California precisely as I do with respect to Virginia. The principles upon which a State may be divided are prescribed in the Constitution, and every State that wants slavery has a right to have it. Ohio has a right to have it now, if she wants it, and can establish it tomorrow, if she chooses."

Mr. Campbell, I understand, the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. Outlaw], to take the same position, viz: That they will not oppose the creation of a slave State out of a part of the territory now included by the act admitting California, and I will assert, in general terms, that the Southern gentlemen are concerned that that is precisely their position upon this question of finality. If I am incorrect, they may now so state.

Mr. Tompkins. No doubt of it. It ought to be.

Mr. Campbell. They assert that it is a part of the Compromise.

Mr. Gentry. The Compromise cannot repeal the Constitution.

Mr. Campbell. Here is the condition of things, and I want it to go forth to the people of this country—to the great outside party, which is about to assemble at Baltimore—that while these gentlemen invoke to their aid the veto power of the Executive of this land, to prevent the people from exercising their constitutional right to legislate upon the law with regard to the reclamation of fugitive slaves, they claim the right to divide that free State, which was admitted as such, as a part of this Compromise. It is to be a finality so far as the claims of the Southern gentlemen are concerned, but not a finality in regard to the admission of California as a free State."

Look at the position of the slaveholders. They decline the test they impose on the North. They reject the bonds they fasten upon the North; they gag and bind the North, while they hold themselves free of speech and hand to say and do what their interests may dictate. They go into National Conventions, and unite with their non-slaveholding brethren in a pledge "to abide by" the act admitting the whole of California as a non-slaveholding State, or what is the same thing, as a settlement in principle and substance of the questions it embraces, which were, shall it be divided, one-half to be admitted as a non-slaveholding State, the other organized as a Territory, with no proviso against Slavery, or shall it be admitted entire, as a non-slaveholding State? And then coolly announce their purpose to act upon one of these questions, whenever it may suit them, just as if it had never been settled, and as if they had not pledged themselves "to abide by" that settlement! This is the value of your finality tests!

The answers of Messrs. Outlaw and Gentry leave us in doubt in regard to their views on the subject of the division of a State. They seem to think that a State has a right to divide itself, and that its application for the sanction of Congress to such division is imperative. They do not say this in terms, but their language implies it. What says the Constitution?

"New States may be admitted by Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or created within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of Congress." (Sec. 3, Art. IV, Fed. Con.)

A new State cannot be formed within the jurisdiction of California, first, without the consent of its Legislature, then, the consent of Congress. Should the Legislature give consent, and the Constitution of California be so amended as to make this consent effective, Congress would be still left free to give or withhold consent, according to its discretion. All the other preliminaries having been complied with, the parties concerned would have a right to ask the consent of Congress, but not to require it, and Congress could withhold consent, without a denial of their rights. Mr. Outlaw, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Tompkins, and those gentlemen who have insisted upon a pledge to abide by the Compromise acts, and have themselves assumed that pledge, could not, without a violation of good faith, vote for such consent. They could not plead the force of any constitutional objection; for the whole question is left discretionary with Congress. Their pledge, therefore, not being adverse to constitutional obligation, could not be disregarded without involving a gross breach of faith.

The questions embraced in that portion of the Compromise relating to the boundary of New Mexico, were settled by the passage of the act, and nobody proposes to reopen them; all parties regard them as finally settled. A pledge on this point was needless.

The questions agitated in relation to the Territories of New Mexico and Utah were—First, Shall a clause prohibiting slavery be inserted in the acts providing governments for them? Secondly, Shall the Mexican law for

bidding slavery be declared in force, or null and void? These questions were settled by the passage of acts, without any anti-slavery proviso, or any declaration respecting the *lex loci*.

The Whig and Democratic Conventions assert the principle of finality in regard to these acts. How many who so voted understand to what they pledged themselves? Suppose several Southern men, with a view to test the value of slave labor in these Territories, should carry slaves into them. A suit for freedom follows, bringing the question of the legality of slavery before the courts, which decide that the *lex loci* against slavery being still in force, it cannot exist in the Territories. Would the slaveholders who voted for finality in the Baltimore Conventions regard their pledge, or would they not renew their old demand for an act by Congress, declaring the Mexican laws no longer in force in the Territories?

On the other hand, suppose the discovery of valuable mines, requiring hard labor and considerable capital for their working, should stimulate a sudden influx of slave immigration into the Territories, and the courts should decide that there was no law to exclude slavery, would all the Northern men who voted for would all the Northern men who voted for the finality principle in the Baltimore Conventions regard their pledge? Whatever they might do, whatever they might suppose their obligations, it is very certain that in neither of the supposed cases could agitation be kept down. In the one case, the North, in the other, the South, would see its demand for the interposition of Congress. Slaveholders have looked at all these contingencies; and as the question of freedom or slavery in the Territories may depend wholly upon the action of the Chief Executive or the decision of the Courts, they take security against danger in the principles of the Territorial Judges, or the character of the President. The North exacts no such security; so that if slavery should fall to obtain a foothold in Utah and New Mexico, it will be owing to Nature and the Providence of God, not to the virtue, the firmness, or sagacity of the Northern People. Does any man dream that the slaveholders would sustain the nomination of Franklin Pierce, unless assured in their own minds that his election would raise no obstacle to their design upon the Territories and upon California? And who of the Northern supporters of Mr. Pierce are asking themselves what effect his election may have in promoting the division of that State, and in favoring slave-emigration to Utah and New Mexico? The Slaveholders act from a Principle—a bad one, if you please, but still it is a Principle—which gives consistency, policy, and power to their action: Northern politics generally act from mere Party considerations, and hence their lack of consistency, unity, and force—hence their time-serving, trimming timidity, and low expediency.

The portion of the Compromise prohibiting the importation of slaves into the District of Columbia, embraced the single question of the slave trade in this District, and settled that alone. The question of slavery in the District was not included, and is therefore left open.

The only remaining part of the Compromise relates to the admission of new States, declaring that hereafter new States shall be admitted into the Union, no matter whether their Constitutions exclude or tolerate slavery. To the maintenance of this policy the two Conventions by their resolves stand pledged, and a departure from it on the part of their members would be deemed a violation of good faith.

Whatever obligations are assumed by the Conventions in adopting these resolutions, are assumed by their Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, in accepting the nominations, unless they relieve themselves from responsibility for a part or all of the implied pledges, by publicly and explicitly disavowing a part or the whole. A bare acceptance of a nomination, without any expression of opinion, one way or the other, is an acceptance of the platform on which it is tendered. The nomination is made with the view to render the doctrines and policy of the platform effectual, and he who accepts it with a secret intention to render it ineffectual, is guilty of treachery.

The nominees having accepted the platforms with all their obligations, it follows that every citizen who votes for them binds himself in the same way. The Southern man who votes for them, pledges himself to oppose the division of California, not to agitate, but to acquiesce, should the Courts of the Territories decide that the *lex loci* excludes slavery, and to assent to the admission of any number of new States, prohibiting slavery. The Northern man who votes for them, pledges himself to silent acquiescence, should slavery grow up in Utah and New Mexico, and State after State, tolerating slavery, apply for admission into the Union, and to oppose the repeal or essential modification of the Fugitive Law—a law without warrant in the Constitution, and inhuman in its details. How many voters of the country will exempt themselves from such obligations, by rejecting such nominations?

Let us not be misunderstood. These obligations would be of Party, not of Morality. No man can bind himself so as to make it his duty to violate his conscientious convictions. But he may place himself in a position where, in obedience to the Law of Right, he must break a vow wrongfully made.

We have shown the identity in policy of the resolutions of the two Conventions respecting the Compromise and the Fugitive Law, in the nature of the obligations imposed by these resolves, and the extent to which they reach. We have to say that they differ as it respects agitation on the subject of slavery. The Whig resolve does not go so far as the Democratic. The former says—
"And we deprecate all future agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and we will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, or however, the attempt may be made."

The latter says—
"The Democratic Party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

One "deprecates" and will "discountenance," the other will "resist"—a stronger word, with a broader meaning. One will discountenance a renewal of the agitation of the questions settled by the Compromise and Fugitive Law; the other will resist the renewal of "the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color."

The Whig resolve does not exclude agitation in regard to slavery in the District, the coastwise slave trade, claims on Congress for indemnity for slaves, the bearings of slavery on the question of the annexation of Cuba, on the possible dismemberment of Mexico and the future annexation of its Northern States; or on the policy sometimes attempted to be brought to the attention of Congress, of colonizing the free people of color. But the Democratic resolve does exclude all this, by its pledge to "resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color."

The Whig resolve does not deprecate, or pledge the party to discountenance, the agitation of the question of slavery, as a moral or religious question; but the Democratic resolve does, in the comprehensive, unqualified term, "under whatever shape or color."

These resolves are in the nature of pledges to abide or to resist Freedom of Discussion, to abide or to resist Freedom of Discussion, and as such, are at war with the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental doctrines of Democracy, Natural Right, and the spirit of the age. Those who voted for and now sustain them, whatever their intention, are enemies of the cause of Freedom, and allies of the cause of Despotism. Were their power equal to their will, American citizens would be as much under censorship as the submissive subjects of Louis Napoleon. But they are as foolish as they are criminal. Both Conventions contemplate the possibility of amendments to the Fugitive Law, to prevent evasion, or correct abuse. Can such amendments be effected without the agitation they pledge themselves to "discountenance or resist?" The prompt response in Congress to the Democratic resolutions was a powerful speech by Mr. Rantoul against the constitutionality of the Fugitive Law! Does any one suppose, that should California appear in Congress, asking a division of her territory, agitation could be kept down? How are you to keep the American People from talking or writing about Slavery, or religious denominations from acting on the subject? And do you think you can gag the Era, or shut up the market for Uncle Tom's Cabin? The very men who have constrained you to adopt these wicked and absurd resolutions, will force you to disregard them, for they are the real agitators. Who but they forced you to make an issue on the finality of certain laws respecting Slavery, which no member of Congress had moved to repeal? And who but they will, whenever it pleases them, force upon you a sectional, Slavery issue, thereby arousing and provoking the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country?

But we take your resolve as the evidence, not of what you can do, but of what you would. By your intention, not your performance, the People will judge you, and the time will yet come when what you have resolved, but not accomplished, will cover you with infamy.

religious question; but the Democratic resolve does, in the comprehensive, unqualified term, "under whatever shape or color."

These resolves are in the nature of pledges to abide or to resist Freedom of Discussion, to abide or to resist Freedom of Discussion, and as such, are at war with the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental doctrines of Democracy, Natural Right, and the spirit of the age. Those who voted for and now sustain them, whatever their intention, are enemies of the cause of Freedom, and allies of the cause of Despotism. Were their power equal to their will, American citizens would be as much under censorship as the submissive subjects of Louis Napoleon. But they are as foolish as they are criminal. Both Conventions contemplate the possibility of amendments to the Fugitive Law, to prevent evasion, or correct abuse. Can such amendments be effected without the agitation they pledge themselves to "discountenance or resist?" The prompt response in Congress to the Democratic resolutions was a powerful speech by Mr. Rantoul against the constitutionality of the Fugitive Law! Does any one suppose, that should California appear in Congress, asking a division of her territory, agitation could be kept down? How are you to keep the American People from talking or writing about Slavery, or religious denominations from acting on the subject? And do you think you can gag the Era, or shut up the market for Uncle Tom's Cabin? The very men who have constrained you to adopt these wicked and absurd resolutions, will force you to disregard them, for they are the real agitators. Who but they forced you to make an issue on the finality of certain laws respecting Slavery, which no member of Congress had moved to repeal? And who but they will, whenever it pleases them, force upon you a sectional, Slavery issue, thereby arousing and provoking the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country?

But we take your resolve as the evidence, not of what you can do, but of what you would. By your intention, not your performance, the People will judge you, and the time will yet come when what you have resolved, but not accomplished, will cover you with infamy.

WHIG NATIONAL CONVENTION.
This Convention met in Baltimore, Wednesday, 16th, in the great hall of the Mechanics' Institute. Delegates representing every State in the Union were in attendance. South Carolina, containing scarcely a vestige of the Whig party, and Georgia, in which that party has been disorganized, both took good care to be represented. As usual, the Southern States, understanding the power of numbers, sent many more representatives than they were entitled to, who, by acclamations or hisses, could strengthen what they favored or weaken what they disapproved.

As a part of the history of the movement, we must not forget another Convention, sectional in character, assembled for the purpose ostensibly of nationalizing the National Convention. The delegates from the slaveholding States, having generally congregated in Washington a few days before the time appointed, held a meeting at which was appointed a committee to adopt resolutions expressive of the doctrines of the Whig party. The committee reported to a meeting of all the delegates from said States, held at Carroll Hall, Baltimore, the evening before the Convention.

On motion of Senator Dawson, John G. Chapman of Maryland, was chosen Secretary, and R. A. Upton of Louisiana, Secretary. Every Southern State was represented; it was a Southern Caucus, to prepare business for the National Convention. The resolutions reported were referred to a full meeting of the friends of the Compromise, held Wednesday morning, by that meeting approved and ordered to be referred to the National Convention, with a request that they be submitted for consideration, to a Committee on Resolutions, to be composed of one delegate from each State in the Union, and that their adoption be respectfully but earnestly recommended.

So the caucus of Southern delegates not only volunteered its services to prepare a platform for the National Whig party, but considerably prescribed the way in which the Convention should proceed to adopt it!

In another place we shall have occasion to notice the resolutions.

It was the intention of the Compromisers to get the control of the Convention from the first, and anticipating by five minutes the hour of twelve, the time fixed for the organization of the meeting, Mr. Morgan of Maryland rose to call the Convention to order, but at the same moment Simon Draper of New York was on his feet, and taking the word out of the mouth of Mr. Morgan, proposed the name of George Evans of Maine, as temporary President, but his motion to vote, and declared it carried. Mr. Upton of Louisiana, and Mr. Bryan of North Carolina, were appointed Secretaries. Mr. Sevier of Louisiana, protested against all action by the Convention, as the hour of twelve had not yet arrived; but his protest passed unheeded, and a Committee of one from each delegation was appointed to present permanent officers for the Convention. A Committee similarly constituted was appointed on Credentials; the meeting then, amidst a storm of noes, resolved to adjourn till the evening.

In the evening the Committee on Organization made its report. As the Committee on Credentials had not yet reported, nobody could say who ought to vote, and Mr. Sherman of Ohio moved, therefore, that the report lie on the table till the credentials were reported on. Immediately an excited debate sprang up, in which delegates from Ohio took an active part. Mr. Ashmun of Massachusetts, and Mr. Botts of Virginia, striving to act as peace-makers. It was a contest between the Scott and anti-Scott men, the gentleman recommended for permanent President being an anti-Scott man.

At last by a rising vote, 380 voting in the affirmative (over 85 more than the legitimate number of voters) the Convention agreed to take the vote on the report by States. The call for the States was then withdrawn, and the report was adopted by acclamation. John G. Chapman, Chairman of the Southern caucus, was chosen permanent President of the Convention; R. A. Upton of Louisiana, Secretary of the Southern caucus, was chosen first Secretary of the Convention. A Vice President from every State was elected, and eleven more Secretaries were chosen. Thus the Compromisers, through the provident care of the Southern caucus, at last obtained the control of the organization.

The convention then adjourned.

The next day, Thursday, the following resolutions were adopted, on motion of Mr. Botts of Virginia:

"Resolved, That in every vote upon which a division shall be ordered, each State shall be entitled to as many votes, and no more, as such State is entitled to in the Electoral College."

"Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives be adopted as the rules of this Convention, so far as the same shall be applicable."

In pursuance, we presume, of the plan agreed upon by Southern delegates, the only man who acted in concert and understood what they were about, Mr. Duncan of Louisiana introduced the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That a committee, to consist of one member from each State in the Union represented in this Convention, be appointed, whose duty it shall be to draft a series of resolutions expressive of the sentiment of the Whigs of the Union on the great doctrines cherished by them, or otherwise a platform of principles to be maintained by the Whigs in the coming contest."

"Resolved, That the members of said committee be selected by the delegation of each State—each State represented appointing its own member, and the committee to appoint its own chairman; and the said committee each member be authorized to cast the number of votes to which said State is entitled in the Electoral College."

Mr. Ewing moved to amend the resolution as amended by substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"That the committee shall consist of one delegate from each State, selected by the delegation from each State."

Mr. Jesup moved to amend the substitute by adding thereto the same clause which on his motion was added to the resolution of Mr. Duncan. A heated debate sprang up, and it soon became evident that the Southern delegates were determined at all hazards to defeat the movement of Mr. Jesup. After several speeches from other delegates, Mr. Dawson of Georgia, who is always pleading for peace in the tone of a warrior, said—

"It is with extreme regret that I rise to say a word to the Convention. I trust that we will all speak with excitement, and act with the utmost deliberation. I agree with my friend from Virginia that this is the first attempt which has ever been made to convert this country into the wildest kind of democracy—the democracy of numbers. Here, for the first time in the history of the country, the large States of the Union presume to control the sovereignty of the States. Sir, the principle which is now contended for will uphold the independence character of the States shall be prostrated to numbers. According to the Constitution, the little State of Delaware or Rhode Island, in one of whose seats I am now sitting, is entitled to the same power in virtue of her sovereignty as either of the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio [Retorted cheering]. And yet some of the conservative party of the country desire to proclaim that numbers shall govern, and not the sovereignty of the States. [Deprecation.] I know that this matter has not been properly considered by the Whig party. [Applause.]"

"This is a great question, a question of power, and shows the necessity of a rigid adherence to the Constitution, in order to preserve the liberty and independence of the States; and I repeat and proclaim it here, that this is the wildest effort that ever was made to alienate one section of the country from the other. Now, sir, let me ask, shall a portion of the sovereign rights of the country be governed by new modes and laws, when the sovereignty of the States are represented by delegates here? [Cheer.]

"I have always belonged to the Whig party because I believe it to be conservative—because

I believe it stood upon principle,